# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 09/686,731 | 10/10/2000 | William L. Eason | 0544MH-40021 | 7126 |

| | |
|---|---|
| 7590 11/05/2003 | EXAMINER |

Christopher W. Kennerly Esq.
Baker Botts L.L.P.
2001 Ross Avenue
Suite 600
Dallas, TX 75201-2980

| EXAMINER |
|---|
| TRAN, LAMBERT L |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2142 | 7 |

DATE MAILED: 11/05/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|  | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|---|---|---|
| **Office Action Summary** | 09/686,731 | EASON ET AL. |
|  | Examiner | Art Unit |
|  | Lambert L. Tran | 2142 |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *10 October 2000* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**    2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-7* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-7* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)        4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) *6* .    6)☐ Other: _____ .

# DETAILED ACTION

1.      This Office action is in response to the application filed on 10 October 2000.

## *Priority*

2.      Acknowledgment is made of Applicant's claim for priority based upon

Provisional Application No. 60/158,731 filed on 11 October 1999.

3.      The effective filing date for the subject matter defined in the pending claims in

this application is 11 October 1999.

## *Information Disclosure Statement*

4.      The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 10 October 2000 (paper

#6) has been considered by the Examiner (see attached PTO 1449).

## *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

5.      The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6.      Claim 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite

for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant

regards as the invention.

7.      Claim 5 preamble reads *"The method of Claim 5, further comprising the step of:"*.

It is distinctively not possible that claim 5 is depending on itself, thus it is not clear what

independent claim this claim is referred to. The Examiner, hereinafter, will assume this

claim depends on claim 4, which is the preceding independent claim.

8.     Claims 6-7 recite the same preamble phrase: *"The method of Claim 5, further*

*comprising the step of:"*. Since claim 5 is being indefinite, it is not clear what

independent claim claims 6 and 7 are referred to. The Examiner, hereinafter, will assume

claims 6-7 depend on claim 4 in this Office action.


## *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

9.     The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

10.    Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Bowman-Amuah, U.S. Patent No 6,636,242, in view of Bass et al., U.S. Patent No

6,549,956, hereinafter referred to as Bass.

11.    In regard to claims 1, 3, Bowman-Amuah disclosed:

*a process module having a plurality of states, each state containing logic defining a*

*portion of a business process, and containing an identifier of a corresponding view to be*

*presented to a user* [see Bowman-Amuah, col. 2, lines 21-25, col. 18, lines 45-65, col. 36,

lines 21-28, col. 46, lines 13-19, col. 101, lines 49-51, col. 191, lines 58-65, col. 251,

lines 66-67];

*controllers* (controller class) *in communication with the process module and a user*

*interface, wherein the controllers translate user input and invoke the process module in*

*response thereto, and wherein the controllers further receive the view identifiers from the*

*process module and generate views for the user compatible with the user interface* [see

Bowman-Amuah, col. 185, lines 33-40, col. 252, lines 4-8].

12.     In regard to claim 2, Bowman-Amuah disclosed the invention substantially as

claimed. However, Bowman-Amuah did not expressly disclose *a content engine*

*connected to the interface for receiving user inputs and invoking the process module; a*

*channel adapter connected to the content engine for receiving the view identifier form the*

*content engine.* In the same field of end-to-end business process [see Bass, col. 4, line

32], Bass disclosed: *a content engine* (PUB/SUB engine, repository) *connected to the*

*interface for receiving user inputs and invoking the process module* [see Bass, col. 5,

lines 28-32, and figure 3]; *a channel adapter connected to the content engine for*

*receiving the view identifier* (unique event ID) *form the content engine, and selecting a*

*presentation to be generated for the user* (publish) [see Bass, col. 2, lines 1-3, col. 7, lines

17-36, col. 7, lines 35-36]. An ordinary artisan in the art at the same time the invention

was made, would have been motivated to look to a way to control conversational flow for

preconditions, postconditions, workflow, and any other additional business logic without

having the model talking directly up to the view [see Bowman-Amuah, col. 252, line 31

and lines 40-41]. The channel adapter taught by Bass would be a perfect fit in this

configuration.

13.     Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the system

design and programming art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated

Bowman-Amuah teachings with the teachings of Bass, for the purpose of providing a

system that is easy to implement yet sustaining performance, and still allow for

information transfer [see Bass, col. 1, lines 57-58].

14.     For the rationale set forth above, claim 2 is rejected.

15.     In regard to claim 4, the combination inventions Bowman-Amuah and Bass

disclosed:

*providing a process module having a plurality of states, each state containing logic*

*defining a portion of a business process, and containing an identifier of a corresponding*

*view to be presented to a user* [see Bowman-Amuah, col. 2, lines 21-25, col. 18, lines 45-

65, col. 36, lines 21-28, col. 46, lines 13-19, col. 101, lines 49-51, col. 191, lines 58-65,

col. 251, lines 66-67];

*receiving the user input* (business event, message) *over the channel* [see Bass, col. 9,

lines 13-14 and lines 22-23];

*sending the user input to the process module* [see Bass, col. 9, lines 15-17];

*within the process module, changing a state thereof and generating an identifier of a*

*view to be presented to the user* [see Bowman-Amuah, col. 252, lines 4-8, see Bass, col.

2, lines 24-26, see Bass, col. 7, lines 17-36];

*selecting a view to be presented to the user which is compatible with the channel* [see

Bowman-Amuah, col. 252, lines 4-8]; and

*sending the view to the user over the channel* [see Bowman-Amuah, col. 252, lines 4-8,

see Bass, col. 7, lines 35-36].

16.     In regard to claim 5, as presumed, Bowman-Amuah disclosed:

*when changing state within the process module* (state management), *accessing a business*

*application software module* [see Bowman-Amuah, col. 101, lines 48-65].

17.     In regard to claim 6, as presumed, Bowman-Amuah disclosed:

*when changing state within the process module, accessing a database* [see Bowman-

Amuah, col. 101, lines 48-65].

18.     In regard to claim 7, as presumed, Bowman-Amuah disclosed:

*when changing state within the process module, modifying data in a database* [see

Bowman-Amuah, col. 101, lines 48-65].

19.     Since all the claims limitations were taught by the combination inventions

Bowman-Amuah and Bass, claims 1-7 are rejected.


20.     Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flores

et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,734,837, hereinafter referred to as Flores, in view of Bass (U.S.

Patent No 6,549,956).

21.     In regard to claims 1, 3, Flores disclosed:

- *a process module* (workflow server) *having a plurality of states, each state containing*

*logic defining a portion of a business process* (workflow trigger conditions: workflow

state based)*, and containing an identifier of a corresponding view to be presented to a*

*user* [see Flores, col. 5, lines 16-18, col. 6, lines 17-19, col. 9, lines 41-46, col. 19, lines

33-49, col. 16, lines 34-38];

*controllers* (controller components) *in communication with the process module and a*

*user interface, wherein the controllers translate user input and invoke the process*

*module in response thereto, and wherein the controllers further receive the view*

*identifiers from the process module and generate views for the user compatible with the*

*user interface* [see Flores, col. 32, lines 2-5, and lines 16-42, col. 16, lines 34-38].

22.    In regard to claim 2, Flores disclosed the invention substantially as claimed.

However, Flores did not expressly disclose *a content engine connected to the interface*

*for receiving user inputs and invoking the process module; a channel adapter connected*

*to the content engine for receiving the view identifier form the content engine.* In the

same field of end-to-end business process [see Bass, col. 4, line 32], Bass disclosed: *a*

*content engine* (PUB/SUB engine, repository) *connected to the interface for receiving*

*user inputs and invoking the process module* [see Bass, col. 5, lines 28-32, and figure 3];

*a channel adapter connected to the content engine for receiving the view identifier*

(unique event ID) *form the content engine, and selecting a presentation to be generated*          .

*for the user* (publish) [see Bass, col. 2, lines 1-3, col. 7, lines 17-36, col. 7, lines 35-36].

An ordinary artisan in the art at the same time the invention was made, would have been

motivated to look to a way to control conversational flow for preconditions,

postconditions, workflow, and any other additional business logic without having the

model talking directly up to the view. The channel adapter taught by Bass would be a

perfect fit in this configuration.

23.    Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the system

design and programming art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated

Flores teachings with the teachings of Bass, for the purpose of providing a system that is

easy to implement yet sustaining performance, and still allow for information transfer

[see Bass, col. 1, lines 57-58].

24.    For the rationale set forth above, claim 2 is rejected.

25.    In regard to claim 4, the combination inventions Flores and Bass disclosed:

*providing a process module having a plurality of states, each state containing logic*

*defining a portion of a business process, and containing an identifier of a corresponding*

*view to be presented to a user* [see Flores, col. 5, lines 16-18, col. 6, lines 17-19, col. 9,

lines 41-46, col. 19, lines 33-39, col. 16, lines 34-38];

*receiving the user input* (business event, message) *over the channel* [see Bass, col. 9,

lines 13-14 and lines 22-23];

*sending the user input to the process module* [see Bass, col. 9, lines 15-17];

*within the process module, changing a state thereof and generating an identifier of a*

*view to be presented to the user* [see Bass, col. 2, lines 24-26, see Bass, col. 7, lines 17-

36];

*selecting a view to be presented to the user which is compatible with the channel* [see

Flores, col. 32, lines 15-21]; *and*

*sending the view to the user over the channel* [see Flores, col. 32, lines 15-21, see Bass,

col. 7, lines 35-36].

26.     In regard to claim 5, as presumed, Flores disclosed:

*when changing state within the process module* (using workflow states in logical

expressions), *accessing a business application software module* [see Flores, col. 19, lines

33-49].

27.     In regard to claim 6, as presumed, Flores disclosed:

*when changing state within the process module, accessing a database* [see Flores, col. 4,

lines 61-64].

28.     In regard to claim 7, as presumed, Flores disclosed:

*when changing state within the process module, modifying data in a database* [see Flores,

col. 4, lines 61-64].

29.    Since all the claims limitations were taught by the combination inventions Flores

and Bass, claims 1-7 are rejected.


### *Conclusion*

30.    The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

   a.    Lynn et al., U.S. Patent No 6,606,740, disclosed development framework

for CASE and workflow systems.

   b.    Tibbetts, U.S. Patent No 6,158,044, disclosed proposal based architecture

system.

   c.    Edwards et al., U.S. Patent No 6,562,076, disclosed extending application

behavior through active properties.

   d.    Cheng, U.S. Patent No 6,067548, disclosed dynamic organization model

and management computing system.

   e.    Sheard et al., U.S. Patent No 6,453,536, disclosed data exchange system

and method.

   f.    Sherman et al., U.S. Patent No 6,205,575, disclosed scenario presentation

tool.

   g.    Beauchamp et al., U.S. Patent No 6,621,505, disclosed dynamic process-

based enterprise computing system and method.

h.      Charles Payne, Dan Thomsen, Jessica Bogle, and Richard O'Brien,

"NAPOLEON: A Recipe for Workflow", Secure Computing Corp., Annual

Computer Security Applications Conference Papers, December 1999.


31.     Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Lambert L. Tran whose telephone number is (703) 305-

4663. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F at 9AM - 5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, David A Wiley can be reached at (703) 308-5221. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-

9700.


L.L.T
Assistant Examiner
GAU 2142
November 3, 2003

MARC D. THOMPSON
*MARC THOMPSON*
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Marc Thompson
Primary Examiner
(703) 308-6750